

REMARKS

Starting at the bottom of page 2, and continuing into the upper portion of page 3 of the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner states that the rejection of claims 1 and 3 stand or fall together, the rejection of claim 2 stands or falls by itself, the rejection of claims 4-11, 14 and 15 stand or fall together, the rejection of claim 12 stands or falls by itself and the rejection of claim 13 stands or falls by itself. With respect to each of these claim groups, the Examiner says that "appellants' brief does not include a statement that this grouping of claims or (claim) does not stand or fall by itself", etc. In answer, it is submitted that each of the claims must be separately considered because on page 5 of the Appeal Brief, it is stated that "the claims, whether independent or dependent are independently patentable" and "that is, the patentability of the dependent claims do not depend solely on the patentability of the independent claims or another dependent claim from which it depends." On pages 6 - 14 of the Appeal Brief, the claims are separately argued as to their patentability over the prior art.

The board is asked to separately and independently consider the patentability of each of the claims, as requested in the Appeal Brief, and then allow the claims for the reason that they are patentable over the prior art.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVID S. SASUGA

By:

  
Delbert J. Barnard  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 20,515  
Barnard, Loop & McCormack LLP  
P.O. Box 58888  
Seattle, WA 98138-1888  
(206) 246-0568

DJB/cmt